NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 05-30224
Plaintiff - Appellee,	D.C. No. CR-94-00332-JAR
v.	
RACHELLE RANAE SHANNON,	MEMORANDUM *
Defendant - Appellant.	

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 05-30225
Plaintiff - Appellee,	D.C. No. CR-95-00224-JAR
v.	
RACHELLE RANAE SHANNON,	
Defendant - Appellant.	

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
James A. Redden, District Judge, Presiding

_____

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be
cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

Submitted March 8, 2006[**]

Before: CANBY, BEEZER and KOZINSKI, Circuit Judges.

Rachelle Ranae Shannon appeals pro se from the district court's denial of her "Motion for Downward Departure Pursuant to §5G1.3 Amendment" construed by the district court as a motion to modify her term of imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for abuse of discretion, *United States v. Cueto*, 9 F.3d 1438, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1993), and we affirm.

Shannon contends that the district court erred by refusing to reduce her sentence pursuant to United States Sentencing Guidelines Amendment 660, which took effect November 1, 2003. Shannon contends that Amendment 660 is a clarification of the guidelines, rather than a substantive change in the guidelines, so the district court may retroactively apply the Amendment to her sentence. However, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion because the Guidelines' list of retroactive amendments does not include Amendment 660, and only expressly retroactive amendments may be applied to a motion brought under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). *See* U.S.S.G. § 1B1.10(a), (c).

AFFIRMED.

[**] This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).